

**SEISMIC SAFETY COMMISSION**

1755 CREEKSIDE OAKS DRIVE, SUITE 100  
SACRAMENTO, CA 95833  
(916) 263-5506  
(916) 263-0594 FAX  
INTERNET: [www.seismic.ca.gov](http://www.seismic.ca.gov)



Seismic Safety Commission  
AB 16 Advisory Committee  
Minutes of Meeting  
August 15, 2002  
The Village at Indian Hill  
Pomona, CA

**Members Present**

Commissioner Stan Moy, *Chair*  
Commissioner Bill Gates  
Commissioner Dan Shapiro  
Bill Holmes, SEAOC  
Thomas Duffy, CASH  
Steve Newsom, CDE  
Gini Krippner, CDF, State Fire Marshal's Office  
Gary McGavin, AIA  
Dick Phillips, EERI  
Dennis Bellet, DSA

**Members Absent**

Commissioner Andrew Adelman  
Abe Hajela, CSBA  
David Clinchy, Los Rios Comm. Coll. District

**Staff Present**

Henry Reyes  
Richard McCarthy  
Henry Sepulveda  
Adam Myers  
Abby Browning

**Interested Guests Present**

Patti Heerhartz, DSA  
Owen Cheung, LAUSD  
Xavier Lujan, LAUSD  
Ron Young, Pomona USD  
Enrique Medina, Pomona USD  
Engel Navea, OPSC  
Suzanne Reese, OPSC  
Larry Brugger, LA City Bldg Dept.  
Steve MacDonald, LA City Bldg Dept.  
Jane Blumenfeld, Mayor's Office, LA  
George Lewis, LAUSD  
Lenin Del Castillo, DOF  
Jim Ward, *Guest Speaker*  
Lowell Shields, *Guest Speaker*  
Tom Blurock, *Guest Speaker*  
Jack Bruce, *Guest Speaker*  
Barbara Helton-Berg, *Guest Speaker*

**I. Call to Order/ Introductions**

Chairman Moy called the meeting to order at 10:05 am. He welcomed everyone to the committee and all members introduced themselves.

The Committee, with the exception of Commissioner Dan Shapiro, who abstained from voting, approved the minutes of the July 24 meeting.

**SEISMIC SAFETY COMMISSION**

1755 CREEKSIDE OAKS DRIVE, SUITE 100  
SACRAMENTO, CA 95833  
(916) 263-5506  
(916) 263-0594 FAX  
INTERNET: [www.seismic.ca.gov](http://www.seismic.ca.gov)



Mr. Henry Reyes introduced the Draft Product outline to the Committee. Currently, the draft includes a background of the Field Act, the Seismic Safety Commission's role, the purpose of the Committee, the members of the Committee, and the scope of work for the Committee.

Mr. Tom Duffy stated that it would be important for the Committee be able to comment on would be policy recommendations on the funding of retrofits for non-Field Act Schools.

Mr. Richard McCarthy responded by asking Mr. Duffy to draft a list of recommendations for the product. Mr. McCarthy further recommended to all committee members to outline any recommendations they would like to see in the final product and submit them to the Committee for review.

**II. Presentation by Lowell Shields**

Mr. Lowell Shields, a mechanical engineer with Capitol Engineering Consultants, began his presentation entitled "Mechanical and Electrical Issues In Conversion Of Non-Field Act Buildings to Schools".

He spoke on several points for the Committee concerning the DSA regulatory process and the role that mechanical and electrical work plays in the conversion of non-Field Act buildings.

It was clarified by Mr. Shields, that the natural gas piping seismic review by DSA is inconsistent, mainly in the field review. In general, mechanical and electrical systems do not get a consistent review by all inspection agencies.

Chairman Moy thanked Mr. Shields for his presentation.

**III. Presentation by James Ward**

Mr. James Ward offered his presentation on the conversion process from a General Contractor's viewpoint. He identified certain issues related to the Field Act that contractors face in general.

He spoke on conversion issues, building selection, common seismic construction, common construction, costs, phasing, and other issues.

Mr. Ward made several suggestions to the Committee about the DSA review process and was asked to submit them in writing.

Chairman Moy thanked Mr. Ward for his presentation.

**SEISMIC SAFETY COMMISSION**

1755 CREEKSIDE OAKS DRIVE, SUITE 100  
SACRAMENTO, CA 95833  
(916) 263-5506  
(916) 263-0594 FAX  
INTERNET: [www.seismic.ca.gov](http://www.seismic.ca.gov)

**IV. Presentation by Steve Newsom**

Mr. Steve Newsom gave a presentation on the State Department of Education's School Facilities Planning Division. He spoke on plan review requirements and the process of selecting a site.

Mr. Newsom noted that the sooner the Department of Education is contacted in the process, the better the opportunity is for a successful project. All issues that pertain to a site are absolutely critical.

Mr. Thomas Blurock commented that the Department of Education's School Facilities Planning Division has been very helpful in the process of trying to retrofit non-Field Act buildings.

Chairman Moy thanked Mr. Newsom for his presentation.

**V. Presentation by Thomas Blurock and Barbara Helton-Berg**

Mr. Blurock presented a case study to the Committee of a non-Field Act building in a shopping mall that was converted into a school building for the Pomona Unified School District (Pueblo Elementary School at the Village at Indian Hills). The Committee meeting was being held in this particular facility.

Ms. Helton-Berg mentioned that one of the difficulties with this case was that when they came into do their initial testing, part of the building was still occupied. This was difficult due to the traffic, noise levels, and time that was added to the testing.

Mr. Blurock mentioned that one thing they did that was helpful was treating the structural upgrades as a separate problem from the interior. The advantages of taking this approach far out weighs the disadvantages.

Ms. Helton-Berg commented that another valuable lesson learned from this case was that they met with DSA very early on and discussed conceptual plans so they would know what was expected and required of them in retrofitting this building. Also, their early plan did not change.

Mr. Jack Bruce (DSA-Los Angeles Office) was also involved in this project as the DSA supervisor. He mentioned that this project had a good site, and a good structurally-simple building. It was important to have the history of the building, the original drawings, all of the modifications, and inspection reviews. Finally, it was important in the case that the design professionals were extremely familiar with public school construction.

Mr. Blurock presented a second case study, a current project for the Los Angeles Unified School District, retrofitting the LA Department of Water and Power building to a school. This project is still in the design/plan stage. This building, however, had more problems and

**SEISMIC SAFETY COMMISSION**

1755 CREEKSIDE OAKS DRIVE, SUITE 100  
SACRAMENTO, CA 95833  
(916) 263-5506  
(916) 263-0594 FAX  
INTERNET: [www.seismic.ca.gov](http://www.seismic.ca.gov)



DSA has approved the designs with many conditions. This structure was an extremely well built building however, feasibility and access compliance issues were important.

Mr. Blurock commented that it was important to remember that with all sites there will be complications. Time is usually more important than money in situations like this.

Chairman Moy thanked Mr. Blurock, Ms. Helton-Berg, and Mr. Bruce for their presentation.

**VI. Presentation by Dick Phillips and Craig Windsor**

Mr. Dick Phillips and Mr. Craig Windsor began their presentation on the third Case Study for Monrovia Unified School District. They said this building was more feasible because almost everything was visible. This was an example of a concrete tilt-up building.

Mr. Phillips mentioned that having the original plans for the building raised the level of confidence for the project.

Mr. Phillips said that the question for this Committee is, what do the inspections need to entail for the State of California to sign off on this building? What can be suggested to improve the level of confidence in this project?

Chairman Moy thanked Mr. Phillips and Mr. Windsor for their presentation.

**VII. Review Case Studies and Recommendations**

The Committee reviewed the previous cases and testimony and concluded that "equivalence" comes with the level of confidence.

Mr. Dennis Bellet commented that the buildings would be considered equivalent to new Field Act buildings when the levels of confidence are the same.

Mr. Gary McGavin noted that both Dick Phillips and Tom Blurock pointed out that the most feasible buildings were the tilt-up buildings because they are the easiest to fix.

Mr. Bellet observed that two tilt-ups with existing plans were approved but the one essential building without existing plans was not approved. Confidence comes when the original plans of the building are available. He suggested that having plans for the building be a minimum requirement for this product.

Mr. Newsom pointed out options that a building would be economically feasible but were missing plans. He said that so many buildings, such as tilt-up concrete buildings, may not have original drawings available, but all of, or most of, the connections are visible and adequate "as built" drawings could be created.

**SEISMIC SAFETY COMMISSION**

1755 CREEKSIDE OAKS DRIVE, SUITE 100

SACRAMENTO, CA 95833

(916) 263-5506

(916) 263-0594 FAX

INTERNET: [www.seismic.ca.gov](http://www.seismic.ca.gov)

Mr. Newsom then suggested that buildings like this should not be excluded, and maybe buildings without original drawings should be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.

Mr. Bill Holmes mentioned that the test of time (meaning if a building has successfully performed for a long time) is an important consideration in gaining confidence in the gravity load system of a building.

Discussions concluded and Chairman Moy thanked the Committee and observers for their contributions.

The meeting adjourned at 1:40 pm for a guided tour of Case Study #1, Pueblo Elementary School at the Village at Indian Hills.